

JANUARY 1719.

A N
ANSWER
TO THE
Five Important Queries,
Contain'd in
Mr. PROLOCUTOR's
POSTSCRIPT
TO HIS
Answer to a Letter, &c.

W I T H
Some fresh QUERIES, humbly offer'd
to the Reverend PROLOCUTOR himself,
relating to the Lord Bishop of BANGOR
and the COMMITTEE.

By a Divine of the Church of England.

*O acutos Homines ! quam paucis Verbis Negotium Confectum
putant ! Ea sumunt ad Concludendum, quorum iis nihil Con-
ceditur.*
Cicero.

L O N D O N :
Printed for JOHN MORPHEW near Sta-
tioner's-Hall. M DCC XVIII.

Account p 29

ANSWER

BY THE

THE IMPORTUNQUE
QUESTIONER

CONTINUED

PROLOGUE.

POSTSCRIPT.

BY THE

ANSWERER.

BY THE

BISHOP OF LONDON,
BISHOP OF SALISBURY,
BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM,
BISHOP OF DURHAM,
BISHOP OF CHESTER,
BISHOP OF ELY,
BISHOP OF WELLS,
BISHOP OF BRISTOL,
BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE,
BISHOP OF DEDHAM,
BISHOP OF DORSET,
BISHOP OF CHICHESTER,
BISHOP OF LICHFIELD,
BISHOP OF METERE,
BISHOP OF RYE,
BISHOP OF DURHAM,
BISHOP OF SALISBURY,
BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM,
BISHOP OF DURHAM,
BISHOP OF CHESTER,
BISHOP OF ELY,
BISHOP OF WELLS,
BISHOP OF BRISTOL,
BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE,
BISHOP OF DEDHAM,
BISHOP OF DORSET,
BISHOP OF CHICHESTER,
BISHOP OF LICHFIELD,
BISHOP OF METERE,
BISHOP OF RYE,



ANSWER TO THE PROLOGUE.

ANSWER TO THE POSTSCRIPT.

ANSWER TO THE PROLOGUE.

ANSWER TO THE POSTSCRIPT.



An Answer to the Five Important Queries.



R. Prolocutor tells his Friend, [these Thoughts or Queries were sent him by an Unknown Person, [who understood the Design and Manner of his foregoing Letter]] with liberty to publish, or conceal them, as he thought fit; but with an Intimation, at the same time, that they deserved to be considered, and replied to. No doubt but the Author esteemed them worthy of the publick View; and Mr. Prolocutor himself [perhaps a little more to be wonder'd at] took them to carry a sharp Point against the Bishop's Sermon, or else he would hardly have tacked them to an elaborate Performance of his own, as effectual to the same Design.

A Copy of them, it seems, was sent to the Bishop of Bangor himself, but no notice taken of it. That was hard, I own. But, the possible Reason might be, because His Lordship might not know how to write to the Author. I believe His Lordship has very few Friends, but think

the much more possible [nay, the most probable] Reason was, because His Lordship saw nothing in it, in the least pertinent to the Question in Dispute. The Querist, moreover, declares himself to be a steady Whig. As Whigs go now a days, 'tis possible he may: He stands clear from the suspicion of Peevishness and Partiality, on account of different Notions with regard to [State] Politicks. Very likely: But if he carries his Enquiries no farther into the Nature of Church-Politicks, than he has hitherto done, he must be contented with but just one half of that Character. But to the Queries themselves.

Query I. Is it any way unlawful for a Christian, or a Member of the Kingdom of Christ, as long as he remains here upon Earth, to be a Member or Officer of any Kingdom or Commonwealth of this World? Very grave indeed! Is it unlawful for a Christian to be a MEMBER of a Kingdom or Commonwealth of this World! i. e. Is it unlawful for him to be what it is impossible for him not to be? But, May be not he an Officer, and, with a good Conscience, accept of, or act in, any Place or Employment of Trust, Honour, or Profit, in the Civil State; always provided, that such Place or Employment lays him under no Engagement to do any thing that is contrary to God's Commands? that is,

" Does Christianity incapacitate a Man for
" being as useful to Civil Society as other Men;
" or deprive him of any of its true Advan-
" tages and just Privileges? Answ. No. Tis

very

very lawful, even for an *Archbishop* to be a *Privy-Counsellor*, and for a *Bishop* to be *Lord-Almoner*. A Thousand Pounds a Year from the Government, does no more Unchristen a Man, than the want of an *Uninterrupted Succession of Regular Ordainers*; or his refusal to make the determination of a *Synod* the *Rule of his Faith and Practice*, does.

Query II. If a Christian is thus [by enjoyment of Civil Posts of Honour and Profit] possess'd of Wealth, Honour, Power, is he not bound to make these Things Instruments, as they give opportunity of Doing Good, unto some Men more especially, and preferably to others; for this very Reason, because they are of the Kingdom of Christ, or Household of Faith? (Gal. vi. 10.)

I answer; That the *Charity* there prescribed by St. Paul, was recommended to be exercised toward Fellow-Christians, with particular regard to them as *Christians*, and probably as *Suffering-Christians*. But, as the former Words oblige us to Charity toward *all* Men in general, from the common sense of Duty to our own Species, and of our Love to God, in whose Image we are all made; so these latter Words, by the Tenour of the Context, and of the whole *Epistle*, oblige our more fervent Charity toward *Christians*, upon account of their special relation to us in *Christ*, to be exerted *equally* toward *all Christians*, without Partia-
lity and unreasonable Distinctions, upon account
of

of any Differences in meer Opinions or Extrernalts of Religion. Which, I humbly apprehend, is enough to render this, and the following Clauses of this Query, absolutely impertinent to the Question in hand. For where as it follows, When any Beneficence of this Nature [from the State, or a private Man] is offered unto a Christian, and that because he is a Christian, is it unlawful for him to accept it, because he is a Member of that Kingdom which is not of this World? What is this but, most Learnedly, to demand, whether Christian States may employ Christian Officers, or one Christian may do good to another? Again, What Offence is it for a Christian, by honest and lawful Ways, to labour for a Competency of the good Things of this World; and when he gets them, to receive them [to use them it shou'd be, for he is supposed to have gotten them before] at the hand of God's Providence, as Blessings, Comforts, Helps and Encouragements in the performance of his Duty? Just now the Question was, Whether a Christian might not receive a Beneficence from another? Now, for fear we should not have Queries enough, it is, Whether he may not labour for the good Things of this World, and use them well, when he gets them himself? But let them both go: Mr. Prolocutor and his Friend, shall have free leave to answer them on their own side; and I'll venture to Promise, the Bishop shall take no Offence at it. But now to advance a little.

Query III. *Where the Civil Legislature, in any Kingdom or Commonwealth, is in the Hands of CHRISTIANS, is it unlawful for them to do what every Christian is obliged to do, viz. To do good to those who are of the Household of Faith, above all others; provided they do not neglect whatever Opportunity they have of doing good unto all Men?* This also is very serious; And, after about a Fortnight's Consideration, I am determined to allow, That it can be no Absurdity for Christian Governments, not only to be charitable to, but to protect, encourage and advance Christian People, rather than others. Well; but may not these Instances of doing Good [for our Querist, you observe, is very Scriptural in his Expressions of this Matter,] be settled and established by such Laws, as the State hath in its power? Doing Good, I remember, was settled by a very strong Law before, viz. the Law of God and of Christ. This will not do; and we want something more. What then are the human Laws to do for us? Why, we have it in the next Words: *May they not, in this manner, provide and secure a Maintenance for those whose Office it is to labour in the work of the Gospel [Ministry;] and grant Privileges and Immunities to the Christian Church, [meaning by the Church, as I suppose, the Clergy;] or are the Ministers of God obliged, and by what Law of God, to reject these worldly Advantages thus offered to them?* By no Law at all, that I know of. I would by no means give the Reverend

verend Prolocutor the Trouble of repairing to his Common-place-Book, for Demonstrations to satisfy us, That Christian Magistrates do not break the Law of Christ, by securing to the Labourer his Hire. Nay, as far as 'tis possible, we will gratify him as to his Immunities too. Let the Privileges, conferr'd by the State upon the Church, be as many and great as they will, they can do no harm, but good, to either Ministers or People; unless [which is the great Temptation arising from worldly good Things] Men make them the Motive of embracing one Religion above another, [and I will add, of embracing one Sect, or Party, of the same Religion above another,] which our Querist allows, in the foregoing Page, to be a Sin. Let the Gentleman, therefore, be easy, as to Privileges and Immunities; let him be in no pain, from any thing the Bishop has said about Spiritual Preferments. I know of no Clergymen that are weary of their Livings; [unless they be very poor ones indeed;] nor have I the least Intelligence of the Bishop of Bangor's Design to throw up his Bishoprick, or Truck it for a Seat amongst the Presbytery.

As to his remaining Clauses under this Head, Whether the Civil [Christian] Legislature, may not, for very good Reasons, put none but Christians into publick Employments of Trust and Profit; — especially if Unbelievers be known to be such Enemies to Christianity, as that they will undoubtedly do all they can to discourage and suppress it; it is so profound, as to be capable of

of no Answer, till it be first resolved, Whether such Magistracy consists of Men of common Sense, or be elected out of Bedlam. The next *Query*, instead of raising us a Peg higher, has darkned the main Argument, even in an equally plain Case.

Query IV. Instead of Christian and Unbeliever, let us put Protestant and Papist. With all our Hearts; for I am sure we have not half so much to fear from Professed Unbelievers, as we have from either Professed or Concealed Papists; and That, upon several Accounts, as neither the *Querist*, nor his Reverend Publisher can be ignorant of, upon Examination. To the Point therefore. *The Papists have not only very much corrupted the Christian Faith and Worship; but are also as bitter Enemies to the Protestants, as ever Unbelievers were to the Christians.* Yes, and much bitterer too, if History and our own sad Experience may be of any Credit. After some Charity expressed toward Papists, notwithstanding this Bitterness of theirs, the Demand is made, *First, Whether a Protestant [as a Private Man] is not bound to, or at least may more lawfully and commendably show greater Kindness to Protestants, than ordinarily he does to Papists?* Which, by the way, tho' readily granted, is not at all to the present purpose. For the true Case is, *Secondly, Whether Our Legislature, being in the hands of Protestants, have not the same Reason to exclude all Papists from Employments of Trust,*

Power, and Profit, as a Christian Legislature ought to do by Unbelievers? Most certainly they have, or else the *Bishop* has written his *Preservative* to very little purpose.

Thus far the Reader sees what a peaceable *Querist* Mr. *Prolocutor* has presented us with. We had hitherto agreed in every thing, and there had remained but *three* small Pages more for any *Debate*; were it not for an unlucky *Parenthesis* dropt into this last forementioned *Question*, which strikes more Light [more *Darkness* I should have said] into the present Affair, than all he had been nibbling at before.

The Reason why *Papists* should be thus excluded, he allows to be the same in *KIND*, but whether it be the same in *DEGREE* he is afraid to determine. Yet, but a few Lines above, he was not at all scrupulous in determining *Papists* to be as bitter and irreconcileable *Enemies* to *Protestants*, as *Unbelievers* ever were to *Christians*. Is not this very odd; That I should believe two sorts of People equally well disposed to fire my House, and cut my Throat, and yet suspect whether the Reason for my endeavouring to put it out of each of their Powers, be equal in degree or no? Well, whatever the Dean of *Chichester* may think; I am in some hopes, our Learned *Prolocutor* may be so impartial as to allow, there may be as beautiful *Contradictions* [to say nothing of *Calumnies*] found in the Writings against the *Bishop* of *Bangor*, as in any thing

thing that has appeared from His *Lordship's* own Hand. And I imagine, this sort of *Beauties* may be the more surprising, for their having passed under the Eye and good Approbation of such Criticks in *Learning*, and Zealots for the *Protestant* Cause.

But, in the Name of Truth and Soberness, how comes any *Protestant*, [nay, a *Whig* too!] to get into his Head the Whim of a Possibility of any *less degree* of Reason for excluding *Papists* from any Places of Trust in *Protestant* Governments, than there can be for excluding *Infidels*? If I may humbly guess, the Difference must lie in this; that the *former* are *Christians*, the *latter* are not so. Behold, good Christian Reader, the mighty Influence of meer *Words*, and external *Denominations*! A *Papist* calls himself, one of the *household of Faith*: The *Protestant*, [tho' conscious this *Papist* has no *Charity* at all] thinks that Destruction from *his* Hand might come with somewhat a milder Ayre, and is not quite so frightful as when it comes from the Hand of one who owns no relation to him, but that of common and humane Nature! Our *Bishop* proposes [and this in a time of manifest Danger and Difficulty, with respect to our common *Protestant Interest*,] That *All*, who will give Testimony of their true Affection to *Protestantism*, or *Christianity*, as to *Religion*, and to King *George's* Government, as to *Politicks*; may be entrusted in the *British* Government, under Him, against the *Common Enemy*. Which

Common Enemy, now to be dreaded, [N. B.] are not so much *Infidels*, as *Papists* and *Non-jurors*. Our *Prolocutor* publishes a Paper, wherein it is, in great Civility left undetermined, Whether there may not be a difference in *degree*, between King *George's* perishing by the Influence of *Papists*, or of some other People. These other People are, indeed, by *Name*, *Unbelievers*; But that, amongst them, are to be ranked the *Presbyterians*, is but too clear [tho' I do not say *designed*] a Consequence, from our *Querist's* next and last *Question*; in which His *Lordship* is to expect the *Coup de Maitre*. For *There*, while the *Papists* have been charitably admitted to a *limited degree* of Reason for *Their* Exclusion from Places of Trust, *These* are to have *no Limitation*, and therefore are, in this respect, put upon the level with *Unbelievers*: This is the intended *Conclusion*. Let's now see from what invincible Premises 'tis drawn.

Query V. The Case, as it stands between the Churches of England and Ireland, as by Law established, and the Presbyterians, it seems, is this: *That towards the middle of the last Century, the Presbyterians of England, Scotland and Ireland, universally enter'd into a solemn League and Covenant*; and, in short, the Purpose and solemn Obligation of this Covenant was, *to root out Episcopacy, and our whole Church Discipline, and establish Presbyterianity*; *That not a single Man, of any Figure amongst*

amongst them, but took this Covenant ; and the whole Party, from that Day to this, continue in the same Principle, none of them having, by any solemn or publick Act, receded from it.

This is a heavy Charge indeed ! And if, with respect to the present Generation of *Dissenters*, it be found really and generally true, I heartily lament the Spirit that is in them, as a great addition to the Calamities of this Protestant Nation. But if, on the contrary, it be, in great measure at least, *not so*, I must equally deplore that uncharitable Temper, which, in so impolitick and merciless a degree, strives to render the Disciples of Christ odious to each other, and weakens that mutual Confidence between *Protestants*, on which alone our common Safety depends.

I know not what Intimacy Mr. *Prolocutor*, or his anonymous *Friend*, or Dr. *Sherlock*, may have with *Dissenters* of this Kind, that warrants them to conclude, with so high a hand, that their owning themselves obliged in Conscience not to conform [at least not constantly] to the *Church of England*, means no less than their Desire and Design utterly to destroy it, *Root and Branch*. I know many Clergymen who are not of that Mind ; who neither make it their Business to *court* the *Dissenters*, nor to *slander* them ; and who, I hope and verily think, have good Reasons for thinking more favourably of great Numbers of these Men, lying under so severe and general an Imputation. On this *Fact* the whole *Argument*, as urged

urged by these Reverend Gentlemen, relies. Let us try then, what mighty Gains they would make, upon supposing it to be *True*; and what wise Friends they must approve themselves both to *Church* and *State*, if there appears but any Probability of its being in great measure *false*.

If so lasting must be the Contagion, and so terrible the Memory of what was transacted by some Peoples Forefathers, *about the middle of the last Century*; methinks the Impressions of what has been taught for a Principle, and put into Practice too, by many others, towards the Conclusion of that Century, and at the beginning of this; nay, even but *Yesterday*, in the sight of all our *Israel*, and before the *Sun*; should be fixt yet deeper upon the Minds of a Protestant People. The *Presbyterians* of those Days, [not without some Provocation, some imprudent Umbrages given to them, and to others also] enter'd into rash and fierce Measures against the *Establish'd Church*. But who are they, who under the Name of *Churchmen*, for almost Thirty Years last past, have been imbibing, and, even with the most *Fanatick* Zeal, propagating those Maxims, on which it were impossible for us to have a *Protestant Government* at all; and blowing up a *Rebellion* more unnatural than even that of *Forty One*, because raised against a *Power*, which not only had all the Right that all the Laws of God and Man can give; but also before there was any *Trial*, or so much as Suspicion of its vi-

olating

olating any Law, or doing the least Wrong to the Subject ? Presbyterians took an Oath ; and, it seems, their Posterity are suspected of being inclined to stand to its Obligation. Many Churchmen have Sworn, and then *Themselves* renounced the Principles they swore to, and resisted the Prince on whom themselves had conferred the Royal Authority by the Solemnest Laws. Presbyterians maintain those Opinions which must end in the great detriment of the *Church* : [the *Church*, I say ; for in respect to *Christianity*, no Accusations are laid against them :] But how are they outnumber'd by *Churchmen*, [and *Zealots* for the *Church* too] who have been maintaining other Opinions, which would totally deprive us of both *Church* and *State*, so far as they are *Protestant*, and *Free*, and *Christian*? In fine, Let it not be insisted on, That *Presbyterians* are still the same they ever were ; till it can be said, That *TORIES* are NOT the same they ever were ; till it can, with a good Grace, and a good Conscience, be said, That *Unlimited Obedience* and *Indefeasable Right* [which utterly debar our present Succession to the *Crown*] and the Necessity of an *Uninterrupted Succession of Regular Ordaining Episcopal Hands* [which Unchurches and Unchristens the greatest part of, if not all, the *Protestant World*] are no longer the Doctrines of *Tories* ; till it can be proved, That *Tories* are not a very large part of the Nation ; or that they would serve *King George* upon the foot, whereon alone he can and

and ought to be King. That foot I take to be the true Revolution-Principle in State, and a just and generous regard to all Protestants, and Protestant-Churches, as Fellow-Members of the same Body of CHRIST; wishing and affording to them all Encouragement, Protection, and Assistance within our Power, agreeably to the Spirit of the Reformation; whereby Great-Britain would be enabled to be the glorious Bulwark, and our Prince the Protector of the common Protestant and Christian Cause, both at Home and Abroad.

This Method of Recriminating, I confess, is an unhappy, and, for the most part, an unacceptable way of arguing. Nor do I use it [God is my Witness] so much for the sake of *Dissenters*, as for the sake of the Government, and the Church itself: To shew all Rational Men, how little would be the Gain, by excluding some from Places of Trust, for fear of the Church, in favour of others, who, by no solemn and publick Act, but what they daily contradict, have receded from those Principles, that must both overthrow the State, and also every thing on which the safety of a Christian Church depends.

But let us try the Querist a little, about the Truth of the Fact itself, in relation to the present *Dissenters* Principles.

Of the Earlier Presbyterians he says, *Perh
aps there was not a single Person of any Figure
excepted, who did not swear to the Covenant.*
If it be no more than a perhaps, then perhaps
there

there were some excepted; and perhaps we may have some of their Successors, who may not esteem themselves bound to the Tenour of that Covenant. And, moreover, perhaps if some of the Church-Clergy also took the Covenant, all their Successors may be of the same Mind, and may, by this Argument, deserve to be excluded from Places of Trust.

But mind we how it was in the next Reign. Upon King Caarles the Second's Restoration, the Renunciation of the Covenant was made a principal Objection, by several of their Ministers, against their conforming to the Church of England. By several of their Ministers! Why, then it was not made so by *all*. And if it was not, then how is it true, that from That Day to This, N O N E of their Party has, by any solemn or publick Act, receded from the Covenant? For, surely, conforming to the established Episcopal Church, is one solemn way of receding from the Covenanted Agreement to destroy it.

And because our *Whig-Author* is pleased to confine his Historical Enquiries to the Times of King Charles the Second, it is but Justice, [and I solemnly declare, I design nothing else to the *Dissenters*, but common Justice and Charity] that we help him a little forward, and give him an opportunity of viewing their Conduct under the following Reigns. King Charks persecuted them, King James flatter'd

flatter'd them, the *Revolution* deliver'd Them and Us from both Temporal and Spiritual Tyranny. Now, Is there any Proof, or even ground of Suspicion, that either King *WILLIAM*, or Queen *ANN*, or King *GEORGE*, ever desired or meditated any Subversion of the present Form of Ecclesiastical Government, in favour of *Presbytery*? And yet, from the Day of the *Revolution* to this Hour, the *Presbyterians* have been as zealous in supporting the Title and Interests of the *Crown*, as any others can pretend to have been; nay, I believe I may venture to say, as unanimously Zealous, as if there had been any Alterations in the *Church* in their Favour.

Our Objector seems to have been so sensible of this, as not to frame his Objection in its full proportion, with regard to the *Crown* equally with the *Church*. Tho' some love to impute to them as lasting and hereditary an Aversion to *Monarchy* as to *Episcopacy*; yet they who even affirm the *Presbyterians* to have cut off King *Charles* the First's Head, have never pleaded against their Capacity of coming into *Places*, out of fear they should cut off King *WILLIAM*, or Queen *ANN*, or King *GEORGE*, in order to set up a *Common-wealth*. And why? Because they could not, and cannot but be sensible, that the Government of these *Princes* is our common

mon Safety, and that their Loss would be our general Ruin, and the Ruin of all Christian Liberty in these Nations.

In all this Period of Time, there was but one Instance of any Person of Eminency, educated in that Way, who sat at the Helm of Publick Affairs. It might have been expected the Presbyterians would have been the first and warmest in their Courtship to him; but, on the contrary, 'twas *Churchmen* that filled the Levy of the new *Minister*, and ran into his Measures; void of all Fears about the *Church*, or about the *Protestant Succession*, or *Protestant Religion* itself.

And now to the *Last Point*, whereon the Querist would be so glad to know my Lord of Bangor's *Thoughts*. Since the Legislature of Great-Britain and Ireland is chiefly in the hands of the Members of the *Church*, as by Law established, is it lawful for them to keep up the Fence, which by the Civil Power is already made about these Churches? — To keep the Presbyterians excluded, as they now are by Law, from Employments of Trust and Profit?

To keep up the Fence? Against what? Against Presbyterians, that would absolutely overturn our Ecclesiastical Government, forcibly destroy Episcopacy, and take our Churches from us? Certainly This is not only *Lawful*,

but highly *Expedient* too. I am apt to think, My Lord of Bangor will as heartily give into this Answer, as the *Prolocutor* himself. But I must say also, that Mr. *Prolocutor*, even when he published this *Paper*, must needs have had some secret Consciousness within him, that *This* was not the true state of the *Question*. For the real Thing in *Dispute* is this : Whether *Fences for Exclusion*, ought not to be proportioned to *Times, Men, and Circumstances*; or must remain always the same, against People who are not the same ? Whether, the taking in of *Dissenters* into a capacity of *Places in the State*, be now either a certain, or probable *Introduction to any thing that will ruin this Protestant Church* ? Whether, Many *Dissenters* are not capable of giving as good *Testimony and Security to the Government*, that they will not promote *Enmities and Violences against Episcopacy*, as the *TORIES* can, that they will not promote [English, tho' not Italian] *Popery* ? Or, Whether, the *Government* can find out no *Method of such Security* ? And, lastly, Whether, *The Government*, in this miserable and distracted *Juncture*, does not really want their *Service* ? Or, Whether Their *Loyal Conduct*, for *Thirty Years past*, does not render them worthy to give *Trial of their Behaviour under the Enjoyment of those Civil Privileges*, which [*cæteris paribus*] cannot be denied to belong equally to all truly *Loyal and Dutiful Subjects* ?

These

These are *Queries* which I humbly leave to the Wisdom of the Government ; not taking upon myself to determine confidently on either side of the *Question*, but only to rescue it from a cloudy and partial Representation.

I shall only beg leave, for my Conclusion, [without the least design of casting any more personal Reflection upon the Querist, than he intended to do upon his Lordship,] to put him in mind of a much more natural Application of the *Scripture-Passage*, where-with he shuts up his *Paper*, and whereby he would insinuate, That the admission of *Protestant-Dissenters* into a capacity of Civil Employments, as Friends to the common Cause of our *Protestant* Government and Religion, may be compared to *Satan's* Proposal to our Saviour, to *cast himself down from the Pinacle of the Temple*; and that it would be to tempt *GOD*. Surely this Nation can never so properly cast it self down from the Pinacle of Happiness, both in Church and State; can in no truer sense *Tempt* her merciful *GOD*; than when, through the Spirit of private Faction, Selfishness, and Animosity, she reduces her *Great*, and only *Stable Principle* to this wretched Condition, that, while *Papists*, *Jacobites*, and *Nonjurors*, are sworn to ruin it; *Half-Whigs* are afraid to

to serve it, *True Whigs* cannot, *Dissenters* must not, and *Tories* most certainly will not.

True Whigs will not be called to account for their conduct, or for their conduct of the country, but *Whigs* will be held responsible for their conduct of the country.



Some



Some QUERIES humbly offered to the Reverend the Prolocutor of the Lower-House of Convocation.

I. Whether the Lord Bishop of Bangor, being fully perswaded of the Truth and Importance of the Doctrine contained in his *Preservative* and *Sermon*, was not, as a *Christian Bishop*, and agreeably to the Spirit of the Reformation, as much obliged in Conscience, or had not as just a Right to write and publish them, as the *Lower-House of Convocation* could have to make a *Representation* against them?

II. Had the Committee's *Representation* produced a *Censure* from Both Houses of Convocation, how far such a *Censure* had been obliging upon the Judgment or Practice of those who are impartially and equally convinced with His Lordship, of the Truth and Importance of such his Doctrine?

III. Whe-

III. Whether the Doctrines of *Nonjurors*, in their late numberless Writings, have not been of as *grievous Offence*, and are not as destructive to the Church of *England*, as these in His Lordship's *Preservative* and *Sermon*? And whether the Circumstances of *Time* and *Persons* have not all this while as justly called for a *Censure* upon *Them*, as *Now* upon the *Bishop*? And if so, then,

IV. Whether this Treatment of the *Bishop*, [after so perfect a Silence and Patience in respect of the *Jacobites* and *Nonjurors*] be a clear * *signification of a dislike to the Doctrine, abstracted from the Person*; or of pure *Duty, Temper, and disinterested Circumspection*?

V. Whether the Doctrines of *Nonjurors*, and *others*, both of Clergy and Laity, which strike at the *Protestant Succession* of the *Crown*, and *Unchristen* the far greater Part, if not the Whole of the *Protestant World*; ought not to have been looked upon as Matters more Criminal, and more immediately fatal in their Consequences, propagated by what *Englishmen* soever, than the *Bishop's* Notions could be, as coming from a *Bishop*? †

* *Prolocut.* Answ. pag. 5.

† *Prolocut.* Answ. pag. 8, 9.

VI. Whether the Bishop's Doctrine is not, at least, capable of a fairer Interpretation, than those Doctrines of Nonjurors and Tories; and, consequently, required not so speedy and zealous an Animadversion from a Synod, as the latter did?

VII. Whether the Lower House's declaring, *The Honour of God and Religion to have been deeply wounded, and the Prerogative, given to all Godly Princes in Holy Scripture, to have been manifestly invaded*, by the Bishop's Doctrine as their Committee has done; do not look as much like a CENSURE, as any other Words they could have framed? And their resting assured, that His Grace and their Lordships [if they found the Cause of the Complaints just] would not fail to enter upon some speedy and effectual Method to vindicate, &c. — ought not [agreeably to the usual and natural Stile of such Writings] to be understood as a Request for a Censure?

VIII. If the Lower House * requested only an Explication from His Lordship; Whether All, who fully and sincerely think the Explication he has given, to be clear, right, and

† Prolocut. Answ. pag. 15, 16.

* Prolocut. Answ. pag. 20.

satisfactory, may not justly acquiesce in that Opinion? Or, Who is to judge for them beside themselves?

IX. What is * That Authority in Externals [of Religion,] without which no visible Christian Church can subsist in Order and Peace? Is it an Authority to force Compliance by Temporal Penalties, or not? In what Hands is it lodged? Or, where-ever 'tis supposed to be lodged, By what Argument can it be proved, That it would procure more Peace, than the Exercise of mutual Love, Charity, and Forbearance?

X. Whether His Lordship [whatever Others did,] had not Reason † to doubt, that his Explications would not have been duly [and impartially] considered, had they been laid before the Synod, [especially after they had censured his Doctrine;] since the Explication he has published, gives the Committee so little Satisfaction?

XI. Whether the Bishop's not having so much as mentioned any one Character or Circumstance of any one particular, or of the whole visible Church, in his Description of

* Prolocut. Answ. pag. 22.

† Ibid.

the *Kingdom of Christ*, was not a sufficient Reason, for all unprejudiced Men, to understand him of the *invisible Church*? And whence, therefore, came that thick Cloud, and [it seems] unaccountable Darkness, that overspread the Minds of Men in this Conjunction? *

XII. Whether, by this Time, we may not safely appeal to the whole sensible part of the World, to determine, Which of the two has laid † the greater load of CALUMNIES, and given the most injurious and stabbing Sentences, His Lordship, or his Adversaries ?

XIII. Whether Mr. Prolocutor, upon further Thoughts, will affirm, That either in any part of the Management of the Reformation at first, or in our Controversial Writings against the Papists since, || nothing was done or said, that left us unguarded and open to one Enemy, while we were pushing another? Nay, and which is more, nothing that left some of the Writers unguarded, even against the very Enemy they pushed? Or, whether, in respect to the true Reformation-Principle, nothing is left, whereon to think deeper, and to push further, than those who have gone before? Nay,

* Prolocut. Answ. pag. 23, 24.

† Prolocut. Answ. pag. 25.

|| Prolocut. Answ. pag. 26, 27.

fact is now arrived to such a point
XIV. Whether, even in the *Church of England's excellent Liturgy, Articles, Canons, and Homilies*, as some Alterations have already been made, for good Reasons, so still also, in order to make the Worship of God very clear and intelligible, and unexceptionable to all soberminded Christians, there may not be some Things highly worthy to be further consider'd on and reformed ?

XV. In particular ; in the Case of ^{*}unwarrantable imposing of Terms of Communion, and in respect to the Right of private Judgment in Matters of Faith, has nothing been written (and practised upon too) even by Members of our own Church, even by Adversaries of Popery, inconsistent with the Spirit of Protestantism? And how had we ever been in any measure cleared of the extravagancy of imposing upon others, or can ever expect to make any Advances in promoting and establishing the Purity of Religion, but by examining Things carefully, after the Example of those that have gone before us?

XVI. Whether a single Quotation out of a Sermon † of Mr. Chillingworth, against some Extravagancies of Puritans, on one side ; be

* Ibid. Pag. 26, 27.

† Ibid. Pag. 27, 28.

in the least any Ballance against the numberless Passages, and the whole Tenour of his famous Book, in opposition to such unwarrantable Church-Powers on the other side, as are opposed by the Bishop of Bangor?

XVII. Whether the Censure or Determination of a Synod, in any Point of Christian Doctrine, be binding upon the People of a Christian Nation, as to Mens inward Judgment, or as to external Silence, or not? If it be; Whether this is not effectually to make it a Bar of humane Authority, superceding that of Reason and Scripture? If it be not; Then is not † a Majority of such [humane] Votes impossible to become a TRIAL to be contended for, either by Truth, or by the Church of England, conformably with the design of the Reformation?

XVIII. Whether there be any* parity of Reason, in Comparing the Lower House of CONVOCATION to a Court of JUSTICE; while the latter is allowed to have an Authoritative Judgment in the Cases that come before them, and Men are authorized by the supream Power to submit to their Decisions; but the former cannot be supposed to have any such Authoritative Judgment at all, in

† Ibid. Pag. 38, 39.

* Ibid. Pag. 57.

Matters of *Doctrine*, as binding upon the *Consciences* of Men, without utterly destroying the foundation both of *Scripture* and the *Reformation*, because *GOD* has neither *Authorized* nor *permitted* any *Man* to *submit* to any humane Authority in *Doctrines* of Religion; and the Reformed Religion was begun in Contradiction not only to the Mind of particular *Synods*, but of *General Councils* too?

XIX. Lastly, In what Manner the Prolocutor Wishes and Prays, that my Lord of Bangor * would sincerely labour to heal those Breaches, and extinguish those Heats, to which his late Writings have very unhappily ministered occasion? To whom may those Breaches and Flames be justly said to be owing? Whether the Bishop has not done his part [and all that is possibly within an honest Man's Power,] to heal them? Or, Whether what the Prolocutor would have, is not, that His Lordship should, most submissively and religiously, renounce the Doctrines he verily believes, in his Conscience, to be True and Christian?